

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT BLUEFIELD

WILLIAM RANCE JONES,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:18-00964

BARBARA RICKARD, Warden,

Respondent.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

By Standing Order, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Omar J. Aboulhosn for submission of findings and recommendation regarding disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) (1) (B). Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn submitted to the court his Findings and Recommendation on March 1, 2019, in which he recommended that the court grant respondent's motion to dismiss, deny petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, and remove this case from the court's active docket.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), petitioner was allotted fourteen days and three mailing days in which to file any objections to Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn's Findings and Recommendation. The failure of any party to file such objections within the time allowed constitutes a waiver of

such party's right to a de novo review by this court. Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir. 1989).

Objections to the Proposed Findings and Recommendation were originally due by March 18, 2019. On March 11, 2019, petitioner filed a motion for an extension of time to file objections. On September 30, 2019, the court granted petitioner's motion, and extended petitioner's time to file objections to October 15, 2019. Neither party filed any objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation within the requisite time period or the extended time period. Accordingly, the court adopts the Findings and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn as follows:

1. Respondent's motion to dismiss is **GRANTED**;
2. Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 is **DENIED**;
3. This action is **DISMISSED**; and
4. The Clerk is directed to remove this case from the court's active docket.

Additionally, the court has considered whether to grant a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A certificate will not be granted unless there is "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The standard is satisfied only upon a showing that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the

constitutional claims by this court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling is likewise debatable.

Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). The court concludes that the governing standard is not satisfied in this instance. Accordingly, the court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

The Clerk is further directed to forward a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to counsel of record and unrepresented parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 23rd day of October, 2019.

ENTER:



David A. Faber
Senior United States District Judge